



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MINUTES AND VERBATIM REPORT

Published under the authority of
The Honourable Don Toth
Speaker



No. 5 — October 22, 2008

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Hon. Don Toth, Chair
Moosomin

Hon. Dan D'Autremont
Cannington

Ms. Doreen Eagles
Estevan

Hon. Donna Harpauer
Humboldt

Mr. Glen Hart
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Mr. Len Taylor
The Battlefords

Mr. Kevin Yates
Regina Dewdney

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Room 8 Legislative Building
11:00 a.m., October 22, 2008

Present: Members of the Board of Internal Economy

Hon. Don Toth, Speaker, Chair
Hon. Dan D'Autremont
Ms. Doreen Eagles
Hon. Donna Harpauer
Mr. Glen Hart
Mr. Len Taylor
Mr. Kevin Yates

Staff to the Board

Mr. Gregory Putz, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly
Mr. Ken Ring, Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel
Ms. Margaret Tulloch, Secretary to the Board

Officials — Legislative Assembly Service

Mr. Darcy Hislop, Chief Technology Officer
Mr. Patrick Shaw, Sergeant-at-Arms

AGENDA Moved by Mr. D'Autremont, seconded by Mr. Hart, that the proposed agenda be adopted. Agreed.

MINUTES Moved by Ms. Eagles, seconded by Mr. Yates, ordered, that the Minutes of Meeting #4/08 be adopted. Agreed.

ITEM 1 Table Item: Legislative Assembly Security Policy

The Chair tabled the report.

The Sergeant-at-Arms responded to questions posed by the Board.

ITEM 2 Information Item: Update on Chamber Lighting Project and RARF Expenditures

The update was presented by the Chief Technology Officer.

ITEM 3 Decision Item: Chief Electoral Officer

The Board met in camera.

The Board resumed public meeting at 12:40 p.m.

Moved by Mr. D'Autremont, seconded by Mr. Yates:

That pursuant to subsection 2.4(1) of The Election Act, 1996, Mr. Jean Ouellet be suspended from his position as the Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Saskatchewan effective October 22, 2008,

And further

That this suspension be without pay and benefits for the period starting October 22, 2008 until the matter is dealt with by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to section 4.1 of The Election Act, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed.

Minute # 1702

The Board adjourned at 12:46 p.m.

Hon. Don Toth
Chair of the Board of Internal Economy

Margaret Tulloch
Secretary to the Board

[The board met at 11:00.]

The Chair: — Okay, I will call the meeting to order. And you have in front of you, I believe, a proposed agenda. Can I have someone move that the agenda be accepted as presented. Mr. D'Autremont.

And we also have the minutes from the last meeting. Oh I guess we need a seconder, right, seconder to approval of the minutes. Mr. Hart. Is everyone agreed? Carried. And everyone have a chance to give a quick run through the minutes? If you have, could I have a motion to accept the minutes as presented.

Ms. Eagles: — I'll make that motion.

The Chair: — Okay. Ms. Eagles. And could I have a seconder for that, please. Mr. Yates. Everyone agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried. Thank you. We have a couple of items on the agenda before us, one regarding security and one regarding Chamber lighting and RARF [Refurbishment and Asset Replacement Fund] expenditures. And these items were basically presented to give the board an opportunity to review and give some thought to where we may go in the future. And I'm wondering if we have any discussion regarding the two items before we move to other business. Any questions? If not . . . Yes, Mr. D'Autremont.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — I'm not sure how many of us have had the opportunity to go over the security policy that is presented before us. So I think it would be worth our while to have some time to take a look at this, and so that we can read it over and talk to our colleagues about it before we make any decisions on this.

The Chair: — And that's what I certainly would recommend as well because — and both with the Chamber lighting — I think having the information in front of you will give you a better understanding of, first of all, where Mr. Shaw's coming from. He's been asking whether we've had a chance to review it, to look at reviewing security. And also we've been in discussion over the past while regarding Chamber lighting and RARF.

So if it's the wish of the committee to bring this up for further discussion at a later date, we'll move forward. And I'd entertain a motion to move in camera unless there was another comment. Mr. D'Autremont.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — We don't have the information on the Chamber lighting update on the RARF expenditures. Darcy is going to come in, I think; isn't he?

The Chair: — Okay, do we want an official to come forward? Okay, can we have someone come? My apologies. I thought we had it in the . . . and the committee members could take it and review it.

Welcome Pat, Greg, and Darcy. We're not into getting into a lengthy discussion on the items. There might be a couple of questions as members take an in-depth look at policies

regarding security and Chamber lighting and RARF. And so if members have any questions at this time? Mr. D'Autremont.

[11:15]

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — We haven't had a chance really to read over the security policy, but if you could give us the thumbnail sketch, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Shaw: — Basically it's what we've been doing for umpteen years, just put down as a building policy for the edification of everybody in the building, and so that if and when we're challenged on why we're doing what we're doing, we have some basis to come back and advise people. So if that tells you what you want to hear or not.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — So this is when you make a decision on who should be in the building or who shouldn't be, whether guests are appropriate in what locations, and how we deal with groups that may want to enter the building and be disruptive — this is what the policy is . . .

Mr. Shaw: — It covers pretty much everything we do here and gives some rationale for doing it.

First and foremost, it's for the protection of yourselves and the staff in the building and any public that is in the building at the time. The policy exists to cover protection of people and protection of assets. And it also outlines the requirements for entry to the building, that people are scrutinized at the entry points; they're issued a visitor's card. We call ahead to the various offices that they're wishing to go to, to verify that in fact yes, they do have a meeting or that the particular office does in fact want to see them. It covers how tours are operated; our physical safeguards; what constitutes our physical security in the building; how incidents are handled; demonstrations; the fact that we do have security plans and contingency plans for just about every feasible incident that you can think of from bomb threat to fire to radiological, biological hazards, etc., hostage-taking and so on; and the responsibilities of various entities in the building in as much as the security policy goes; visitor services, what they do; Government Services; Wascana Centre Authority; and the requirements from the Legislative Building offices themselves.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — When you mention the various threats that could be in place, do you review what happens in other jurisdictions? I'm particularly thinking of biological and the House of Commons, Westminster.

Mr. Shaw: — Yes, we do.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — I know that the policies they had in place, while one would have thought they were effective, turned out not to be.

Mr. Shaw: — Yes, when we're aware of any of those incidents, we review them. And of course on an annual basis when we meet to discuss security with the Sergeant-at-Arms conferences, these things are all discussed, and whether or not the policies in place at the time worked and why they didn't and what should be done. And in fact we didn't, up until about four years ago,

have anything covering the radiological, biological, but as a result of an incident in another jurisdiction, we developed it.

And of course I've been an advocate for a number of years on metal detectors as you well know — thought I'd just mention that — and good reason for it. And I'm always in awe when we have our conferences and people describe what people are bringing in to our legislative buildings on their person or in their briefcase. It's quite eye-opening.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — I was there the day that Blair got hit with the flour bombs during question period, and how they dealt with that was not the way you want it done.

Mr. Shaw: — No. Required isolation, which didn't happen. People just fled in every direction, and if there was any contaminate, it would have spread it throughout the building.

The Chair: — Questions? Mr. Yates.

Mr. Yates: — Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I noticed that one, on page 4 talks about . . . Pardon me, not page 4; I'm on the wrong page. Page 3: "Anyone wearing clothing printed with an expression that is deemed offensive by the legislative security will not be granted access to the building." What standards are used or what type of materials are deemed to be offensive?

Mr. Shaw: — Well we've had people come in with T-shirts on that have had phraseology on that, you know, you wouldn't want showing up in the galleries.

Mr. Yates: — Okay.

Mr. Shaw: — Or for somebody walking around throughout the building. Really, I guess, pornographic.

Mr. Yates: — Okay. If somebody came in having a meeting with somebody, a scheduled meeting with somebody, and was wearing that type of clothing, would they just be asked to go and come back when they're wearing appropriate clothing? I'm just sensitive to, you know, this is the people's building and we'd want to, as much as possible, have access. If somebody was wearing a shirt, they hated or they disliked a particular individual or, you know, or something like that . . .

Mr. Shaw: — Well there's two incidents I can think of where we have turned people away unless they were appropriately dressed. One had nothing to do with the appropriateness of it; it was having to do with a demonstration. This was a couple of years ago where people were wearing T-shirts in support . . . They were coming in as visitors to the gallery, had been demonstrating, but had T-shirts on that were in support of their demonstration. Of course our policy is you can't bring placards or bullhorns or anything that mentions why you're demonstrating. So they were asked to remove them and they did.

On one other occasion about two years ago, somebody came in with a very offensive T-shirt on with swear words on it, and it was not appropriate. And they were given the opportunity to lose the T-shirt and come back in or just not come in at all. And as a result, they took the T-shirt off and came in.

I suppose it is and it isn't a subjective matter, but I think any one of us here could, without any difficulty, determine what was offensive and what wasn't. It isn't a matter of whether it's something you just don't like; it's whether it's offensive.

Mr. Yates: — Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, my second question has to do with . . . are there any planned upgrades to security, an example, the doors? Currently we have large — I don't know, one and a half by two and a half or whatever— cards to get in after hours. Technology today, you can get things a quarter that size doing the exact same as what those cards will do. As we upgrade, are we looking at improving the types of devices we use for entry and those types of things?

Mr. Shaw: — Well we have upgraded once from a swipe card to a proximity card, and in actual fact women can just hold their purse up to that proximity card and it works. We do now have fobs that we use, that we're issuing to people. I believe some of the MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly] have them and some of the ministers have them.

Mr. Yates: — What are they?

Mr. Shaw: — They're a fob that fits on your key ring. I don't know if I've got mine with me or not. I don't. But it's a fob. You just point it at it and you're in. There's no . . . pardon?

A Member: — A teardrop shape.

Mr. Shaw: — A teardrop-shape thing that fits on your key ring.

Mr. Yates: — That's the type of technology I was thinking about . . .

Mr. Shaw: — So we have switched to that now. And as these cards are being replaced, we're replacing them with the fobs.

Mr. Yates: — Okay, that's what we have, a wallet-size card.

Mr. Shaw: — Yes.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. That's exactly what I was thinking about. Today what we used to have to put on a card, the swipe card or whatever, can come in a much smaller device and is much easier kept in your pocket.

Mr. Shaw: — Right, and we're finding that they have more longevity than the cards do because they're not subject to being cracked or bent and so on.

Mr. Yates: — Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: — Do we have any further questions of our guests? Some on the lighting with Darcy? Mr. D'Autremont.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — Yes, Darcy, I wonder if you could give us an update on the lighting and where that is in the process.

Mr. Hislop: — Sure. You probably noticed this morning it's not installed. We've got the majority of the electrical work completed. The fixtures, the vendor informs me, have arrived.

We're waiting for the dimmer packs and the fader controls, the electronics part of that to arrive. They tell me it should be here by the end of the week. Then we'll have to get those installed in our control room and up above over the next little while.

We will probably delay the actual implementation until after the fall session. There's some fixtures, brackets, mounting bars for the fixtures themselves, that have to be installed in the Chamber that will involve scaffolding or scissor lifts up into the corners. So it's not something we can really get in and out too quickly.

It would have been nice to have it in for the fall session. Unfortunately — a couple of days, a week, week and a half out — we're going to have to delay it until we're done the fall session.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — What's happening with the overhead projectors for the two caucus meeting rooms, 218 and 255?

Mr. Hislop: — The caucus boardroom equipment, we've had four vendors invited in who have done site inspections. I did have an opportunity earlier in the summer to meet with caucus representatives about what was originally put forward in the RARF or budget submissions. We clarified a couple of things. I noticed that from comments Greg passed along from late last week, I think we want to revisit some of the audio system requirements to just make sure we got it right.

The important thing is these vendors have come in. They've looked at the rooms. They have an understanding of what the requirements are — the size and the scale and the scope — particularly the government office which is an extraordinarily large boardroom.

I would like to, in the next week or so, fine-tune those requirements, both particularly the integrated audio for the government one and have an opportunity with the opposition folks to see if that's of interest and of use. From there we'll have to probably re-tender just because that would be a change from what we requested of the vendors. So I'd want to make sure that it was a fair procurement process. We have an idea cost-wise now what these things would incur, and we'll have to develop some strategies to accommodate the budget amounts because that would exceed what was originally requested.

That being said, again installation in those boardrooms is significant — what they're proposing with ceiling mounts, recessing fixtures for speakers, and the projector. I would imagine that would probably be invasive during session. So again I would suggest that we hold that till once session's done so that we can get equipment and staff and scaffolding up there. But I would like to get those requirements salted away in the next, like I say, week or so.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — I think that's . . .

The Chair: — Do you have any further questions of our witnesses? If not, thank you for coming in and filling us in on some of the issues that are ongoing, have further discussion giving the members an opportunity to get a clear understanding of what's being proposed. Thank you. Moving on to other business.

Mr. Yates: — I move that we move in camera.

[11:30]

The Chair: — It's been moved by Mr. Yates that we move in camera. Have we got a seconder to that one? Ms. Eagles. Is everyone agreed? Oh I guess I could fill it out. You've got to sign it. The committee will now move in camera then. Thank you.

[The board continued in camera.]

The Chair: — Okay, after previous discussion, can we have a motion to the discussion in camera. Mr. D'Autremont.

Hon. Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. I would move:

That pursuant to subsection 4.2(1) of *The Election Act, 1996*, Mr. Jean Ouellet be suspended from his position as the Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Saskatchewan effective October 22, 2008, and further, that the suspension be without pay and benefits for the period starting October 22, 2008, until the matter is dealt with by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to section 4.1 of *The Election Act, 1996*.

The Chair: — Do we have a seconder? Mr. Yates. Any further discussion? Seeing none, we all agree?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — It is agreed. Carried. Is there any further business before the board this morning? Seeing none, this board meeting is adjourned until the call of the Chair. I thank each and every one of the board members for giving of your time on this challenging day ahead of us, but enjoy the rest of the day. Thank you.

[The board adjourned at 12:46.]